

Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza\*

A theologian dealing with biblical texts is often working at the same time with established traditions of reading them. This is as true for the scholar who wishes to contest a reading as for those who would confirm it. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza engages here in an applied study of Jesus' choosing of 'the twelve'.

JMS

In his letter to the Corinthian church, Paul explicitly refers twice to the behavior of women in the worship service of the community. However both references, 1 Cor 11:2–16 and 14:33–36, present for the exegete and historian great difficulties of interpretation. It is very doubtful whether we will be able to reconstruct the correct meaning of these passages at all. Not only is the logic of the argument in 1 Cor 11:2–16 difficult to trace, but it is also debated whether Paul demands the veiling of women or pleads for a special form of hairstyle. Since both passages seem to contradict Gal 3:28 and Paul's own theology of freedom from the Law, some scholars attribute 1 Cor 11:2–16<sup>1</sup> and most scholars 14:33b–36<sup>2</sup> to the early catholic theology of the post-Pauline school.

The exegesis of these texts is even more hampered by the apologetic, theological controversy surrounding them. From the outset of the women's movement these Pauline passages were used against women's demand for equality.<sup>3</sup> Antifeminist preachers and theologians maintained and still maintain that the submission of women and their subordinate role in family, society, and church was ordained and revealed through Paul. Whenever women protest against societal degradation and ecclesial discrimination Paul's arguments are invoked: Woman was created after man, she is not the image of God, she brought sin into the world and therefore she has to be submissive

\* Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, 'Women in the Pre-Pauline and Pauline Churches', *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 33 (3 and 4) (1978).

and is not allowed to speak in church or to teach men. And those theologians rejecting patriarchal submission but upholding an "equal but different" or "two-human-nature"<sup>4</sup> theology point out that Paul maintains the creational difference between women and men without denying their equality.

Feminist thinkers on the other hand argue that Paul's statements give evidence that Christianity was at a very early stage sexist and that therefore a revisionist feminist appropriation of Christian theology is doomed to failure. They criticize the Pauline texts for their patriarchal theology which legitimizes our contemporary patriarchal structures in society and church.<sup>5</sup>

Christian apologists respond to this feminist challenge by defending Paul as a "liberationist."<sup>6</sup> Paul's writings, they argue, correctly understood and interpreted, support women's equality and dignity.<sup>7</sup> Not the Pauline message but the patriarchal or feminist misunderstanding of this message preaches the subjugation of women. The gist of the controversy is summed up in a book title: "Paul: Male Chauvinist or Feminist."<sup>8</sup>

Because of the apologetic interest to defend Paul against his feminist critics this revisionist approach does not sufficiently take into account the methodological issues and hermeneutical decisions involved on both sides of the debate. The hermeneutical discussion<sup>9</sup> and the sociology of knowledge<sup>10</sup> have underlined how important it is for exegetes and theologians to reflect on their presuppositions and on the theoretical models which they employ to assemble historical "data." This is of special consequence for the reconstruction of early Christian history because our sources do not have an immediate historical interest but rather are written for pastoral and theological purposes. Our understanding of the significance of the Pauline injunctions therefore does not only depend on a perceptive historical-critical interpretation of the texts but much more on the theoretical model of early Christian history in the context of which we formulate our questions and organize our exegetical results.

Since not only Biblical exegesis but historiography in general is a selective view of the past, its scope is not only limited by extant sources and materials but also shaped by the interests and perspectives of the present. As contemporary societal-cultural perspectives shift, the historian's perception and selection of what was important in the past and is worthwhile studying today also shifts.<sup>11</sup> Historians are not able to abstract from their presuppositions, ideologies and the interests of the powerstructures determining the questions and models with

which they assemble the accessible information. The reconstruction and understanding of the past is never determined solely by so-called historical facts but always also by the presuppositions and interests of historians whose methodological approaches are decisively influenced by personal experiences and social mythologies.

Feminist scholars have therefore rightly pointed out that historians study historical sources in general and Biblical texts in particular from a patriarchal<sup>12</sup> perspective. Our Western conceptual framework and historical paradigm is determined by the understanding that "humanity is male and man defines woman not in herself but as relative to him; she is not regarded as an autonomous being. He is the subject, the absolute. She is the other."<sup>13</sup> This conceptual framework functions as a social mythology that determines women's and men's socialization and self-perceptions.<sup>14</sup> It marginalizes women and justifies the present structures of power that make women to be the weaker, "second" sex.

The problem with revisionist apologetics therefore is not so much that it has Christian or feminist presuppositions and criteria but rather that it fails to question the androcentric or patriarchal model underlying the scholarly reconstructions of early Christian history. Insofar as scholars single out the "role of women" as a special problem they reflect our own cultural, androcentric perspective according to which male existence is the standard expression of human existence and Christian history. In such an androcentric paradigm only the role of women becomes a special historical problem while the androcentric presuppositions of such an historiography remain unexamined. In order to understand and theologially evaluate the Pauline injunctions for women it is therefore necessary to critically analyze how scholars reconstruct early Christian history and how they define the role of women in the early Christian communities.

---

#### THE ANDROCENTRIC RECONSTRUCTION OF EARLY CHRISTIAN HISTORY

---

Since the academic writing of early Christian history shares in the androcentric paradigm of Western culture, it reconstructs the history of the early church according to the model of male dominance that marginalizes women. This becomes evident when we analyze the presuppositions underlying the study of women in early Christianity.<sup>15</sup>

*First:* Such studies generally presuppose that men have initiated the

early Christian missionary movement and that only they had leadership in it. The discussions of discipleship, apostleship,<sup>16</sup> church order, worship or missionary activity tacitly assume that these leadership functions were exercised by males only. In analyzing 1 Cor 11:2–16 and 14:33–36 exegetes neglect to place these texts into their historical situation and their immediate context. Instead scholars presume that only these texts speak about women, whereas the rest of chapters 11–14 deals with male prophets and enthusiasts. In a similar fashion the information which the “people of Chloe” gave to Paul is characterized as gossip.<sup>17</sup> The “people of Chloe” are not considered as her followers or associates but as her slaves,<sup>18</sup> although we find a similar genitive construction in the immediate context, where Paul speaks of the different parties that claim different apostles as their spiritual leaders (1 Cor 1:11 ff.). Another example of such an androcentric interpretation is the understanding that Rm 16:7 refers to two male apostles, although Junia or Julia was a common female name of the time and patristic exegesis acknowledged that the passage refers to a woman apostle.<sup>19</sup> Because of the unquestioned presupposition that the early church was a “man’s church” such androcentric studies understand the women mentioned in the Pauline letters as helpers of the apostles who supported especially Paul in his missionary work. This androcentric model has no room for the alternative possibility that women were missionaries and leaders of churches *before* Paul and on the same level with Paul. It could well be that Paul had no other choice than to work with women whose leadership was already well established in the pre-Pauline and Pauline churches.

*Second:* In such an androcentric model masculine terminology<sup>20</sup> is understood in a twofold way: as generic and as gender specific. On the one hand most exegetes would agree that standard masculine terms as elect, saints, brothers or sons do not designate males over against females but apply to all members of the Christian community. Masculine language in these instances is not used in a gender specific but in a generic inclusive way. On the other hand, when discussing leadership titles as e.g. apostles, prophets, or teachers, exegetes assume that these titles apply to men only although we have one instance in the Pauline literature where such a masculine title is applied to a woman. In Rm 16:1 f. Phoebe is characterized by the masculine form of the title *diakonos*. Therefore, we can assume that NT androcentric language on the whole is inclusive of women until proven otherwise.

*Third:* Androcentric interpretations still propose that the available information on women in early Christianity reflects the actual situa-

tion and roles women had in the nascent church, although NT scholarship generally recognizes that the NT authors do not give us accurate historical information about the life of Jesus or about the earliest communities. Source- and redaction-critical studies have demonstrated that the NT writers did not incorporate all available information into their works, but that they selected the materials according to their own theological purposes. A few examples for such an androcentric traditioning process should suffice. Paul’s letters refer to women as co-missionaries in the early Christian movement, whereas Acts only mentions the contributions of wealthy women as patronesses but does not picture women as missionaries. Or: While all four gospels know of Mary Magdalene as the first witness to the resurrection, Paul does not list any woman among the resurrection witnesses.<sup>21</sup> Or: The Fourth Gospel claims that a woman had an important role in the beginnings of the Samaritan mission (Jn 4:4–42), whereas Acts mentions Philip as the first missionary in Samaria (Acts 8:4–13). Since the NT authors write from an androcentric point of view and select their information accordingly we can conjecture that they transmit only a small fraction of the information on women available to them. Therefore, the sparse NT references to women do not at all adequately reflect women’s actual role and contributions to the history of early Christianity. They allow us, however, a glimpse of the possibly rich traditions which we have lost.

*Fourth:* One could argue that such an androcentric model of interpretation is methodologically appropriate because early Christianity mirrored its patriarchal culture and religion. However, the studies of the socio-cultural attitudes of the Jesus movement in Palestine point out that this movement was a socially and religiously deviant group.<sup>22</sup> Jesus and his first followers were not well adjusted members of their society but were in opposition to many cultural and religious values of their time. Jesus did not call into his fellowship the righteous, pious, and powerful, but all those who “did not belong”: tax collectors, sinners, prostitutes, poor people, and women. This inclusive egalitarian movement of itinerant disciples understood itself in kinship terms and thereby replaced traditional family roles and bonds. Women, like men, are no longer defined by patriarchal marriage and procreative family roles but by their allegiance to the community of disciples.

However, G. Theissen, whose work is influential in the social study of early Christianity, has argued that the early Christian missionary movement outside Palestine did not stand in conflict to its society but was well integrated into it. The radicalism of the Jesus movement in

Palestine was assimilated by the urban Hellenistic communities into a family-style love-patriarchalism which perpetuated the social, hierarchical relationships of the patriarchal family in a softened milder form.<sup>23</sup> The classic expression of this love-patriarchalism is found in the household codes of the Deutero- and post-Pauline literature (Col 3:18 f.; Eph 5:21–33; Tit 2:4 f.; 1 Petr 3:1–7). In my opinion, however, it must be questioned whether these can be used to establish such a love-patriarchalism for the pre-Pauline and Pauline communities. The allusions of the genuine Pauline letters to the leadership of women suggest that the subordination demands of the household codes were not yet operative in the earliest congregations of the urban Hellenistic centers. Not the patriarchal family but the egalitarian community structures of collegia or cultic associations which accorded women and slaves equal standing within the community, appear to have provided the model for the early Christian missionary movement in the Greco-Roman world.<sup>24</sup>

---

#### WOMEN IN THE PRE-PAULINE AND PAULINE CHURCHES

---

Only when we reconstruct the history of the early Christian movement according to an egalitarian, non-androcentric model are we able to adequately integrate the available information on women's leadership that is found in the letters of Paul. Although this information is very fragmentary it nevertheless permits us to trace women's role in the churches before Paul and associated with Paul.

*First:* The Pauline letters mention women as Paul's co-workers but they do not give any indication that these women were dependent on Paul or subordinate to him. Only five of Paul's co-workers (Erastus, Mark, Timothy, Titus, and Tychicus) "stand in explicit subordination to Paul, serving him or being subject to his instructions."<sup>25</sup> The genuine Pauline letters apply missionary titles and characterizations as e.g. co-worker (Prisca), brother/sister (Apphia), *diakonos* (Phoebe), and apostle (Junia) also to women. They usually equate co-workers and "those who toil." In 1 Cor 16:16 ff. Paul admonishes the Corinthians to be "subject to every co-worker and laborer" and to give recognition to such persons. 1 Thess 5:12 exhorts the Thessalonians to "respect those who labor among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you." It is therefore significant that Paul uses the same Greek verb "to labor" or "to toil" not only to characterize his own missionary

evangelizing and teaching but also with reference to women. In Rm 16:6, 12 he commends Mary, Tryphana, Tryphosa and Persis for having "labored hard" in the Lord.

Paul also affirms that women have worked with him on an equal basis. Phil 4:2 f. explicitly states that Euodia and Syntyche have "contended" side by side with him. As in an athletic race these women have competed alongside with Paul, Clemens, and the rest of Paul's co-missionaries in the cause of the Gospel. Paul considers the authority of both women in the community at Philippi so great that he fears that their dissensions could do serious damage to the Christian community.<sup>26</sup> These women missionaries commanded the same esteem and respect as Paul's male co-workers in the community at Philippi.

*Second:* The house-churches were a decisive factor in the missionary movement insofar as they provided space, support, and actual leadership for the community.<sup>27</sup> The house-churches were the place where the early Christians celebrated the Lord's supper and preached the good news. Theologically the community is called the "house of God," the "new temple" in which the Spirit dwells.<sup>28</sup> Since women were among the wealthy and prominent converts (cf. Acts 17:4.12), they played an important role in the founding, sustaining and promoting of such house-churches. The following texts which speak of women as leaders of house-churches demonstrate this: Paul greets Apphia "our sister" who together with Philemon and Archippus was a leader of the house-church in Colossae to which the letter to Philemon is written (Phm 2).<sup>29</sup> Paul also mentions twice the missionary couple Prisca and Aquila and "the church in their house" (1 Cor 16:19; Rm 16:5). In a similar fashion the author of the letter to the Colossians refers to Nympha of Laodicea and the "church in her house" (Col 4:15). According to Acts the church at Philippi began with the conversion of the business woman Lydia from Thyatira who offered her house to the Christian mission (Acts 16:14). We also know from Acts that a prayer meeting was held in the house of Mary, the mother of John Mark.

We have therefore no reason to assume that women were excluded from the leadership of such house-churches and from presiding at their worship. The love-patriarchalism of the household-code tradition could therefore be a later patriarchal reaction to the leadership of women within the house-churches, but cannot express the original order of the pre-Pauline churches. This hypothesis is supported by 1 Tim 2 where the injunctions that women should be submissive are given in the context of regulations for prayer meetings and teaching as

well as in the context of patriarchal requirements for church leadership.

*Third:* One of the most prominent heads of a house-church and outstanding co-worker of Paul is Prisca or Priscilla who together with her husband Aquila worked with Paul. Yet like Barnabas or Apollos she too was independent from the Apostle and did not stand under his authority.<sup>30</sup> Paul is grateful to the couple because they have risked their lives for him. Yet not only he but all the Gentile churches have reasons to give thanks to these outstanding missionaries (Rm 16:4). Their house-church in Corinth, Ephesus, and Rome (if Rm 16 is addressed to that community) was a missionary center at each place. 1 Cor 16:19 has greetings from the couple. Even though Prisca is mentioned here after her husband, it is remarkable that she is referred to by name at all, since normally the husband alone is named in such greetings. However, it is significant that whenever Paul sends greetings to them (Rm 16:3f.) he addresses Prisca first, thus underlining that she is the most important of the two (cf. also 2 Tm 4:19).

Acts also mentions Prisca before her husband, which corresponds to the information of the Pauline letters (cf. Acts 18:2 ff.; 18:26).<sup>31</sup> Since Luke concentrates in the second part of the Acts on the greatness of Paul, he refers to the couple only in passing. Even these brief remarks, however, indicate the great influence of the couple. We therefore can assume that Luke had much more information about them than he transmits to us. Like Paul, Priscilla and Aquila were by trade tent-makers and supported their missionary activity through their own work. Like Paul they were Jewish Christians and financially independent from the churches they served. Like Paul they travelled to spread the gospel and suffered for their missionary activity. When Claudius banished the Jews from Rome, they were expelled from there and moved to Corinth. In Ephesus they converted Apollos, one of the greatest apostles and missionaries alongside Paul (18:26), and taught him "the way of God more accurately." The text clearly assumes that Prisca was the catechist and teacher of Apollos.<sup>32</sup>

While Prisca and Aquila are not explicitly called apostles, another couple receives this title in Rm 16:7. Like Aquila and Prisca, Andronicus and Junia (Julia) were a missionary couple who were apostles before Paul. Since apostles had to have had a missionary task and a vision of the resurrected Lord<sup>33</sup> we can conjecture that the couple was among the more than 500 "brethren" to whom the Lord appeared and of whom most were alive when Paul wrote 1 Corinthians (1 Cor 15:6). Andronicus and Junia are at the writing of Rm 16 fellow prisoners

with Paul and they are praised as "outstanding" among the apostles. We can conclude from 1 Cor 9:5 that the couples Priscilla and Aquila and Andronicus and Junia were not exceptions among the early Christian missionaries since the other apostles on their missionary journeys had "sisters" with them as "wives" (lit. women). If the term "brother" can characterize a particular group of missionary co-workers (cf. Phil 4:21 ff.),<sup>34</sup> then we can surmise that "sister" refers likewise to the women as missionary co-workers. The double accusative obj. (sister, woman) is best explained in this way. We therefore can assume that many early Christian missionaries were couples. When Paul stresses celibacy as the best precondition for missionary work (1 Cor 7:23 ff.) he is expressing his own opinion but does not concur with the practice of the early missionary church. Moreover we have no indication that the work of such missionary women, who labored in tandem with their husbands, was restricted to women.<sup>35</sup>

*Fourth:* Phoebe appears to have been one of the most prominent women in the early church. In Rm 16:1 f. she is characterized by three titles: Paul calls her "our sister," a *diakonos* of the church at Cenchreae, and a *prostatis* "of many and myself as well." Exegetes take pains to downplay the significance of these titles because they are given to a woman. Whenever Paul uses the title *diakonos* to refer to himself or another male leader, scholars translate it with minister, missionary, or servant, whereas in the case of Phoebe they usually render it with deaconess. After characterizing Phoebe as an "obviously well-to-do and philanthropic lady" Lietzmann goes on to say: "Even at that time there had long been women deacons in the Christian church who, when *their sex made them especially suitable*, came forward and gave signal help in caring for the poor and sick, and at the baptism of women"<sup>36</sup> (emphasis mine). Unconsciously Lietzmann projects here back into the first century the duties of the deaconesses of a later period whose service was restricted to the ministry to women. Yet the text does not indicate any limitations of the office of Phoebe by prescribed gender roles. She is not a deaconess of the women in the church at Cenchreae but a minister of the whole church.

Paul uses the term *diakonos* in tandem with *synergos* (co-worker) in 1 Cor 3:5, 9 and 2 Cor 6:1, 4. According to 1 Cor 16:15 the co-workers and laborers are those who "have devoted themselves to the *diakonia* of the saints." However, in distinction to the co-workers the *diakonoi* appear to be not only travelling missionaries but leaders of local congregations. The term is used in the NT and in secular sources to refer to preaching and teaching.<sup>37</sup> Thus the *diakonoi* served in the

recognized and designated, "official" capacity of teachers and preachers. We therefore can presume that Phoebe was an "official" minister and teacher in the church at Cenchreae.

The importance of Phoebe's position as minister in the church at Cenchreae is underlined by the title *prostatis* which is usually translated with "helper" or "patroness," although in the literature of the time the term has the connotation of leading officer, president, governor, or superintendent.<sup>38</sup> Since Paul claims that Phoebe was a *prostatis* "of many and also of himself," scholars reject here such a meaning. However, in 1 Thess 5:12 the verb characterizes persons with authority in the community and in 1 Tim 3:4 f. and 5:17 it designates the functions of the bishop, deacon, or elder. We therefore can assume that Phoebe had a position of great authority within the community of Cenchreae and that her authority was not limited to this congregation but was widely respected, even by Paul himself. Phoebe receives a recommendation similar to that of Timothy in 1 Cor 16:10 f.<sup>39</sup>

*In conclusion:* Paul's letters indicate that women were among the most prominent missionaries and leaders of the early Christian communities. They were co-workers with Paul but did not stand under his authority. They were teachers, preachers, and prophets. As leaders of house-churches they had great influence and probably presided also at the worship celebrations. If we compare their leadership with the ministry of the later deaconesses it is striking that their authority was *not* restricted to the ministry for women nor to specific feminine functions.

Such a leadership of women in pre-Pauline and Pauline Christianity was legitimized by the theology expressed in Gal 3:28. In the Christian community all distinctions of race, religion, class, and gender are abolished. All members are equal and one in Christ. Gal 3:28 probably is a traditional baptismal formula<sup>40</sup> which was quoted by Paul in this letter in order to support his view that there is no longer any distinction between Jew and Gentile in the Christian community. This pre-Pauline baptismal formula expresses the self-understanding of the newly initiated Christians over against the societal-religious differences accepted in the Greco-Roman culture of the time. It was a rhetorical commonplace that the Hellenistic man was grateful that he was born a human being and not a beast, a Greek and not a Barbarian, a man and not a woman. This pattern seems to have been adopted by Judaism and found its way into the synagogue liturgy. Three times daily the Jew thanked God that he did not create him a Gentile, a slave, or a woman. In distinction to this cultural-religious pattern shared by Hellenists

and Jews alike<sup>41</sup> the Christians affirmed at their baptism that all cultural-religious differences are abolished among them.

It is important to note, however, that this baptismal formula does not yet reflect the same notion of unification and androcentric perspective found in later gnostic writings.<sup>42</sup> Whereas according to various gnostic texts to become a disciple means for a woman to become "male" and "like man" because the male principle stands for the heavenly, divine realm while the female principle is secondary, Gal 3:28 does not extoll maleness as the standard and form of the new life<sup>43</sup> but Jesus Christ, in whose body—the church—male and female gender roles are transcended. Since the pairs "Jews and Greek" as well as "free and slave" indicate the abolition of cultural-religious differences within the Christian community (cf. 1 Cor 12:12 ff.), we safely can assume that the same applies to the third pair "male and female." The legal-societal and cultural-religious distinctions between Jews and Greeks and slaves and free are transcended in the Christian community insofar as, on the one hand, Jews and Greeks and slaves and free remain legally and socially what they are, but on the other hand have equal standing in the church. In a similar fashion the biological-sexual-legal differences between men and women remain but gender roles and their cultural-religious significance<sup>44</sup> are no longer valid for the Christian community.<sup>45</sup> This new egalitarian Christian self-understanding did away with all distinctions and privileges of religion, class, and caste and thereby allowed not only Gentiles and slaves but also women to exercise leadership functions within the community. Since even wealthy women were marginal people in antiquity, they must have been very attracted to such an egalitarian movement, which granted them authority and leadership within the church. Therefore not the love-patriarchalism of the post-Pauline school but the egalitarian ethos of pre-Pauline and Pauline Christianity provides in my opinion the context for Paul's injunctions concerning the behavior of women in the Corinthian community.

---

#### WOMEN'S BEHAVIOR IN THE WORSHIP SERVICE OF THE COMMUNITY

---

Although we have only scanty information on women in early Christianity, we have seen that the community of Corinth had at least three outstanding women leaders in their midst. The followers of Chloe

approached Paul with questions to which he responds in the letter and Prisca lived and worked at Corinth. Most renowned is of course Phoebe who was a minister of the church at Cencreae, the nearby seaport of Corinth.

However, it is also significant that the Corinthian Christians understood their faith in terms of Hellenistic-Jewish Sophia theology.<sup>46</sup> "The Spirit" was believed to be "the 'Wisdom of God' and the Spirit-Wisdom bestows the gifts of wisdom upon those who cultivate her gifts, and who live upon her supramundane level."<sup>47</sup> The Corinthians understand the significance of Jesus Christ in terms of Jewish-Hellenistic Sophia-speculation which also has determined the pre-Pauline christological NT hymns<sup>48</sup> and which was developed in connection with the Isis-religion.<sup>49</sup> They are convinced that they are able to receive divine Wisdom because God has given them a pneumatic-spiritual nature (cf. Gn 2:7). This Sophia-theology is found not only here but also in the Synoptic tradition and we must be careful not to label it too quickly as "gnostic"<sup>50</sup> and therefore heretical.

Since in this theology Wisdom was conceived as a semi-hypostatic female figure we can surmise that women were especially attracted to become her devotees. In the worship service of the community where the divine Wisdom-Spirit was present and all received her "spiritual" gifts women as well as men were pneumatics and therefore had equal leadership within the community. The immediate context of Paul's injunctions concerning women's behavior in the worship service of the community gives evidence that women as well as men do share in the pneumatic gifts of Wisdom-Spirit and pray and prophesy publicly under the influence of the divine Spirit. Paul explicitly affirms that in doing so the Corinthians have followed his teachings and example (11:2) and he does not disqualify this "spiritual" self-understanding and practice of the Corinthian pneumatics. The contrast between 1 Cor 11:2 and 11:17 underlines that Paul does not refer here to any particular abuse but introduces regulations and customs which were observed in other Christian communities (11:16, 14:33).

The injunctions concerning women's behavior, however, are not peripheral to Paul's argument but of great concern to him as their place in the structure of the letter indicates. The whole section of chapters 11-14<sup>51</sup> speaks of the pneumatic worship service of the community and is composed in the form of a thematic inclusion insofar as the section begins and ends with the problem of women's correct behavior in the worship assembly. The concluding verses 14:37-40 indicate how serious the issues are for Paul and how much

he expects resistance to his viewpoint. Paul appeals to the prophets and pneumatics to accept his arguments as a revelatory word of the Lord himself (v. 37).<sup>52</sup> He assures the Corinthians that he does not want to hinder prophetic and ecstatic speaking but that he is concerned that everything "should happen decently and in the right order" (v. 40). Thus it seems to be Paul and not the Corinthians who attempts to qualify or to change the pneumatic behavior of the community. His major line of argument is decency and the right order, values which are not specific Christian.<sup>53</sup> At the same time Paul is in a difficult position since he had originally spoken to them about the new life in the Spirit and the Christian freedom evolving from it.<sup>54</sup> In order to understand Paul's position more fully we have to analyze the injunctions of 1 Cor 11:2-16 and 14:33-36 more in detail.

*1 Cor 11:2-16:* We no longer are able to decide with certainty which behavior Paul criticizes and which custom he means to introduce in 1 Cor 11:2-16. Traditionally, exegetes have conjectured that Paul insists that the pneumatic women leaders should wear the veil according to Jewish custom.<sup>55</sup> Yet v. 15 maintains that women have their hair instead of a head-covering and thus militates against such an interpretation. It is therefore more likely that Paul speaks here about the manner in which women should wear their hair<sup>56</sup> when praying and prophesying (v. 13). It seems that the women prophets and pneumatics have let down their hair during the worship celebration as the worshippers of Isis appear to have done. For instance a woman friend of the poet Tibullus is said to have had to let her hair down twice daily in the worship of Isis to "say lauds."<sup>57</sup> Archeological evidence also shows that the female devotees of Isis usually wore long hair "with a band around the forehead and curls falling on the shoulder"<sup>58</sup> while the male initiates had their head shaven. Hence Paul's sarcastic statement in vv. 5f. that the women who loosen their hair might as well have it cut short or shaven. It is as disgraceful to loosen one's hair as it is to shave it.

The Corinthian pneumatics presumably took over such a hair fashion because they understood their equality in the community and their devotion to Sophia-Spirit in analogy to the Isis cult since Isis was also said to have made the power of women equal to men<sup>59</sup> and her associations admitted, like the Christian communities, women and slaves to equal membership and active participation.<sup>60</sup> Paul, on the other hand, insists on a different hairstyle probably because loose hair had a completely different meaning in a Jewish-Christian context.

According to Jewish sources loosed hair continued to be a sign of

uncleanness even to Paul's day.<sup>61</sup> Nm 4:18 (LXX) prescribes that the woman accused of adultery be marked publicly by loosening her hair. Similarly in Lev 13:45 (LXX) one of the signs for the uncleanness of a leper is loosed hair. The Jewish woman very artfully braided her hair and pinned it up so that it formed a kind of tiara on her head (cf. Judith 10:3; 16:8), an effect highlighted by adorning it with gold, jewelry, ribbons, or a silvery gauze.<sup>62</sup> In view of this hairstyle the exegetically difficult statement in v. 10 becomes more understandable. Paul argues: Since the angels<sup>63</sup> are present in the pneumatic worship service of a community that speaks the "tongues of angels", women should not worship as cultically unclean persons by letting their hair down, but they should pin it up in the form of a tiara or crown as a sign of their spiritual power.

However Paul not only insists on a different hairstyle but also on the differences between women and men. He adduces the following Scriptural and theological arguments for his position: *Firstly*, Paul sets forth a descending hierarchy: God-Christ-man-woman,<sup>64</sup> in which each preceding member as "head" stands above the other "in the sense that he establishes the other's being."<sup>65</sup> *Secondly*, Paul declares that man is created to be the image and manifestation of God, while woman is only the glory or reflection of man, because man was created prior to woman and woman was created because of him (vv. 7–9).<sup>66</sup> Of course, this interpretation of Gn 2 flies directly in the face of the Corinthian Jewish-Hellenistic interpretation of Gn 2:7 which insisted on the pneumatic-spiritual nature of all persons. "A rabbinic reason for denying women the image-of-God status was precisely that they did not have the same religious duties as men."<sup>67</sup> Another rabbinic tradition thinks that the image-of-God status consists in circumcision and therefore a woman is *ipso facto* not the image of God. *Thirdly*, In vv. 11–12 Paul maintains that his insistence on the creational difference and hierarchy between men and women does not deny the interdependence of men and women within the Christian community.<sup>68</sup> However, that Paul does not want to speak here of the equality of men and women is evident by the fact that he refers shortly afterward in 1 Cor 12:13 to the baptismal formula of Gal 3:28 but omits the pair "male and female." This is significant because it is exactly at this point that Paul stresses that all are equal members of the body of Christ although they have different pneumatic gifts and functions. *Fourthly*, Paul employs the Stoic argument from nature<sup>69</sup> which was widely used against emancipatory tendencies in the Greco-Roman world to insist on the difference between men and women. *Finally*, Paul has to resort

to an authoritarian appeal, probably because he himself senses that his arguments are not very convincing theologically. Therefore he declares that it is party spirit and contentiousness if the Corinthians do not accept his injunctions and he insists that he and the other churches do not acknowledge another practice. Nevertheless, Paul's argument does not deny that women are pneumatics and pray and prophesy in the worship service of the community. He argues, however, that they should retain the traditional hairstyle and respect the differences between women and men.<sup>70</sup>

1 Cor 14:33–36: It is debated whether 14:33b–35(36) is an authentic Pauline injunction or whether the passage was added by a later editor of the Pauline school. However, since the verses cannot be excluded on textual-critical grounds but are usually declared to be inauthentic on theological grounds, it is exegetically more sound to accept them as an original Pauline statement and to explain them within their present context. As in chapter 11 so in chapters 12–14 Paul seeks to persuade the Corinthians that decency and order should be more highly esteemed than the spiritual status and exercise of the individual. While the Corinthians seem to have valued glossolalia most, Paul favors the gift of prophecy and interprets it in terms of reason, order, and mission (14:4, 5, 19).<sup>71</sup> The Corinthian pneumatics should not be concerned with the exhibition of their spiritual greatness but with the building up of the community (14:4f.) and with the impression they make on interested outsiders (14; 16, 17, 23 ff.).

14:26–36 are best understood to be a church order<sup>72</sup> with rules for glossolalists (vv. 27 ff.), for prophets (vv. 29–32), and for wives (vv. 33b–36). These three rules are formulated in a structurally similar fashion. A general sentence of regulation (vv. 27, 29, 34) is complemented by a sentence that concretizes it (vv. 28, 30, 35). The second and third rules are expanded with reasons for the regulation (vv. 31–32, 34a, 35b). However, the rule for wives is different insofar as it has an introduction (v. 33a) and ends with a double rhetorical question (v. 36). These stylistic additions seem to underline the importance of the last regulation.

1 Cor 14:33–36 is often understood to speak about women in general and therefore to contradict 11:2–16 which presupposes that women are pneumatics and as such pray and prophesy within the worship of the community. However, the difficulty is resolved if we recognize that the injunction does not pertain to all women but solely to wives, since chapter 7 documents that not all women in the community were married and could ask their husbands at home. 1 Cor

7:32–35 confirms the interpretation that the prohibition in 14:33–36 applies just to wives. Although in 1 Cor 7 Paul acknowledges the equality and reciprocity of husband and wife,<sup>73</sup> his ascetic preference for the unmarried state is plain.<sup>74</sup> In 7:32–35 he interprets the apocalyptic “as if not” tradition of 7:29–31 in a christological missionary perspective. The married person, Paul argues, is divided and concerned with the issues of marriage and family while the unmarried person is completely dedicated to the affairs of the Lord. It is apparent that Paul, here, is “taking over bourgeois moral concepts which denote not absolute but conventional values.”<sup>75</sup> Paul’s argument is surprising, especially since we know of leading missionary couples who spent their life in the service of the Lord.

However, only the singleminded dedication of the unmarried woman and virgin and not that of the unmarried man is further qualified with the subordinate clause “that she may be holy in body and spirit” (7:34). Paul ascribes here a special holiness to the unmarried woman and virgin apparently because she is not touched by men (cf. 7:1).<sup>76</sup> We therefore can surmise that Paul is able to accept the pneumatic participation of such “holy” women in the worship service of the community but argues in 14:34 f. against such an active participation of wives.

Paul derives his theological argument from the Jewish–Hellenistic propaganda tradition that places the demand for the subordination of wives in the context of the Law.<sup>77</sup> This tradition has also influenced the household codes of the post-Pauline literature. However one could argue that the *hypotassein* of v. 34 does not demand submission to husbands but to the regulations of the community. As in 7:35, so here Paul concludes his injunction by pointing to propriety (v. 35b).

The subsequent rhetorical questions in v. 36 indicate the counter-argument which Paul expects. It is often suggested that these questions refer to the whole community because the wives could not have argued that the word of God originated with them or that they were the only ones whom it has reached. However, when we consider that leading early Christian missionaries such as Prisca, Junia, and perhaps Apphia were married and that in general the other leading women mentioned in the Pauline letters are not characterized as virgins, widows, or unmarried, such a counter-argument becomes plausible. Since we have seen that wives were called to missionary preaching and were founders of house churches, Paul’s claim that these women should be silent and ask their husbands at home sounds preposterous. Paul realizes that this regulation goes against the accepted practice of

the missionary churches in the Hellenistic urban centers. He therefore claims for his regulations the authority of the Lord (v. 37). In the final analysis, however, not theological reasons but the concern for decency and order determines Paul’s regulation concerning the behavior of pneumatic women and men in the worship service of the community (v. 40).

*In conclusion:* In the preceding analysis I have attempted to argue that the Pauline injunctions for women in 1 Cor should be understood in the context of women’s leadership in early Christianity. 11:2–16 on the one hand does not deny women’s prophecy and prayer in the worship assembly but insists that in the Christian community women and men are interdependent. However they should not deny in their behavior the creational differences and hierarchal relationships. The community rule of 14:33–36 on the other hand has a specific situation in mind, namely the speaking and questioning of wives in the public worship assembly. Here as in 7:34 and 9:5 Paul appears to limit the active participation of wives in the “affairs of the Lord.” His concluding rhetorical questions indicate that he does not expect his regulation will be accepted without protest by the Corinthian community which knows wives as leading Christian apostles and missionaries. Yet Paul is more concerned that order and propriety be preserved so that an outsider cannot accuse the Christians of religious madness. In both passages, then, Paul places a limit and qualification on the pneumatic participation of women in the worship service of the community. We do not know whether the Corinthian women and men accepted his limitations and qualifications. However, the love-patriarchalism of the Deutero-Pauline household codes and the injunctions of the Pastoral Epistles<sup>78</sup> are a further development of Paul’s argument that will lead in the future to the exclusion of all women from ecclesial office and to a gradual patriarchalization of the church.<sup>79</sup>

In response to R. Scrogg’s attempt to rescue Paul from the uninformed attacks of his feminist critics, Elaine Pagels has maintained as a hermeneutical principle: “It is really not my intent to put Paul on trial before a panel of NT scholars or debate whether he is 30%, 75%, or 100% a feminist. After all, these are criteria that have emerged from our own present situation. To attempt simply to judge Paul by such standards seems to me anachronistic and a waste of time.”<sup>80</sup> I have attempted to show, to the contrary, that firstly, the feminist quest for the equality of women was alive in pre-Pauline and Pauline Christianity, and that Paul for the sake of “order” and for the sake of attracting outsiders appears to react to it. Secondly, the

hermeneutical discussion has driven home that a value-free historical inquiry unencumbered by present-day concerns is intellectually not possible. Feminist scholarship is not the exception of the rule but openly demonstrates that all scholarship is determined by contemporary issues. Finally, in my opinion, scholars cannot refrain from passing judgment on biblical texts because the NT is not just a historical work of the first century but functions as Holy Scripture for Christian communities today. Insofar as the Bible is not only a document of past history but inspired Scripture for today exegetical-Biblical studies cannot avoid the question of the *meaning* of NT texts for today.

A hermeneutic-theological approach that is concerned with the contemporary meaning and authority of the Pauline injunctions in a post-patriarchal society and church, however, has to insist that solely non-sexist and non-oppressive traditions of the NT and non-androcentric models of historical reconstruction and biblical interpretation do justice to divine revelation, if the word of God is not to become a tool for the patriarchal oppression of women and a theological justification of sexist societal and ecclesial structures. The theological significance of Paul's injunctions for today has to be judged accordingly. After all, Paul himself has insisted: "For freedom Christ has set us free; stand fast therefore, and do not submit again to a yoke of slavery" (Gal 5:1 RSV).

## Notes

1. W. Munro, 'Patriarchy and Charismatic Community in "Paul"', in J. Plaskow and J. A. Romero (eds.), *Women and Religion*, 2nd edn. (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974), 189-98; Wm. O. Walker, '1 Cor 11:2-16 and Paul's View Regarding Women', *JBL* 94 (1975), 94-110; and the critical review of this proposal by J. Murphy-O'Connor, 'The Non-Pauline Character of 1 Cor 11:2-16?', *JBL* 95 (1976), 615-21.
2. Cf. G. Fitzer, *Das Weib schweige in der Gemeinde* (ThE 110; Munich: Kaiser, 1963), and H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 246, for the arguments against the authenticity of the passage.
3. Cf. E. Cady Stanton, *The Original Feminist Attack on the Bible (The Woman's Bible)* (New York: Arno Press, 1974), esp. the introduction by B. Welter; cf. also the 'Pastoral Letter of the Massachusetts Congregationalist Clergy (1837)', in A. S. Kraditor (ed.), *Up From the Pedestal* (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1968), 50 ff.
4. Cf. 'Vatican Declaration: Women in the Priesthood', *Origins* 6 (1977), 518-24, and the supporting comment by D. Burrell, 'The Vatican Declaration: Another View', *America* (2 Apr. 1977), 289-92, 291: 'for I cannot but suspect that Lawrence would find the Vatican Declaration profoundly accurate in the way it links sexuality with the symbolic dynamics of human salvation.' For a

feminist analysis of the political implications of this 'two-human-nature' concept, cf. B. W. Harrison, 'The New Consciousness of Women: A Socio-Political Resource', *Cross-Currents* 24 (1975), 445-62; id., 'Sexism in the Contemporary Church: When Evasion Becomes Complicity', in A. L. Hagemann (ed.), *Sexist Religion and Women in the Church* (New York: Association Press, 1974), 195-216.

5. Cf. M. Daly, *Beyond God the Father* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1973), and the review article by C. Christ, 'The New Feminist Theology: A Review of the Literature', *Religious Studies Review* 3 (1977), 203-12.
6. Cf. e.g. R. Scroggs, 'Paul Chauvinist or Liberationist?', *Christian Century* 89 (1972), 307-9; id., 'Paul and the Eschatological Woman', *JAAR* 40 (1972), 283-303, and 42 (1974), 532-49.
7. e.g. A. Feuillet, 'La dignité et le rôle de la femme d'après quelques textes pauliniens: Comparaison avec *L'Ancien Testament*', *NTS* 21 (1975), 157-91; J. Massyngberde Ford, 'Biblical Material Relevant to the Ordination of Women', *JES* 19 (1973), 669-94.
8. R. and J. Boldrey, *Chauvinist or Feminist? Paul's View of Women* (Michigan: Baker Book House, 1976); cf. also P. J. Ford, 'Paul the Apostle: Male Chauvinist?', *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 4 (1975), 302-11.
9. For a general discussion cf. K. Frör, *Biblische Hermeneutik* (Munich: Kaiser, 1961); R. Funk, *Language, Hermeneutic and Word of God* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966); E. Schillebeeckx, *The Understanding of Faith* (New York: Seabury, 1974); J. A. Sanders, 'Hermeneutics', *Suppl. Vol. IDB* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976), 402-7, and my attempt to apply the hermeneutical principles of the Constitution on Divine Revelation of Vatican II to the problem of how to evaluate the teachings of the NT on women: 'Understanding God's Revealed Word', *Catholic Charismatic* 1 (1977), 7-10.
10. For the heuristic value of 'models' cf. I. G. Barbour, *Myth, Models and Paradigms* (New York: Harper & Row, 1974).
11. Cf. K. Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia* (London: Routledge, 1954), 243: 'Every epoch has its fundamentally new approach and its characteristic point of view and consequently sees the "same" objects from a new perspective.' For a feminist analysis cf. H. Smith, 'Feminism and the Methodology of Women's History', in B. A. Carrol (ed.), *Liberating Women's History* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1976), 368-84.
12. I use 'patriarchal' in the sense of a societal system of male dominance and female submission and marginality.
13. S. de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex* (New York: Knopf, 1953), pp. xvff.
14. E. Janeway, *Man's World, Woman's Place* (New York: Dell, 1971), 307, points to the emotional component of social mythology. Therefore not logic but only 'an answer in reality to those needs which the myth answers in phantasy' will bring about change in such a social mythology (emphasis mine).
15. Cf. my article 'The Study of Women in Early Christianity', in Thomas J. Ryan (ed.), *Critical History and Biblical Faith* (Villanova: Villanova University Press, 1979).
16. Cf. my articles 'The Twelve' and 'The Apostleship of Women in Early Christianity', in L. and A. Swidler (eds.), *Women Priests: A Catholic Commentary on the Vatican Declaration* (New York: Paulist Press, 1977), 114-23 and 135-40. In my writings I have consistently pointed to the apostleship of Mary

- Magdalene; cf. E. Schüssler, *Der vergessene Partner* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1964), 57 ff.; 'Mary Magdalene: Apostle to Apostles', *UTS Journal* (Apr. 1975), 22 f.; 'Die Rolle der Frau in der urchristlichen Bewegung', *Concilium* 12 (1976), 3-9.
17. Cf. e.g. W. A. Meeks, *The Writings of St. Paul* (New York: Norton, 1972), 23: 1 Corinthians 'is a response to reports which have come to Paul by two means: (1) a letter, brought by an official delegation, Stephanus, Fortunatus, and Achaicus (16:17, cf. 7:1) and (2) *gossip* from "Chloe's people" (1:11), otherwise unknown' (emphasis mine).
  18. Cf. the discussion by G. Theissen, 'Soziale Schichtung in der korinthischen Gemeinde. Ein Beitrag zur Soziologie des hellenistischen Urchristentums', *ZNW* 65 (1974), 255. However Paul writes *ek* with genitive when speaking about slaves of a household (cf. Rm 16: 10 f.; Phil 4:22).
  19. Cf. Bernadette Brooten, 'Junia . . . Outstanding among the Apostles (Romans 16:7)', in Swidler and Swidler, *Women Priests*, 141-4, and J. M. Lagrange, *Saint Paul: Epître aux Romains* (Paris, 1916), 366.
  20. For the problem of masculine language cf. R. Lakoff, *Language and Woman's Place* (New York: Harper, 1975); Miller and Swift, *Words and Women* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Press, 1976); L. Russel, 'Changing Language and the Church', in *The Liberating Word* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976), 82-98; and the extensive bibliographical review by M. R. Key, *Male/Female Language* (Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1975).
  21. Cf. 1 Cor 15:3-10. The conclusion drawn by R. E. Brown is therefore questionable: 'The priority given to Peter in Paul and in Luke is a priority among those who became official witnesses to the Resurrection. The secondary place given to the tradition of an appearance to a woman or women probably reflects the fact that women did not serve at first as official preachers of the Church'; cf. R. E. Brown, 'Roles of Women in the Fourth Gospel', in W. Burkhardt (ed.), *Woman: New Dimensions* (New York: Paulist Press, 1977), 116 n. 12.
  22. Cf. J. G. Gager, *Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1975), 22-37; R. Scroggs, 'The Earliest Christian Communities as Sectarian Movement', in J. Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults* ii (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 1-23; G. Theissen, 'Itinerant Radicalism: The Tradition of Jesus Sayings from the Perspective of the Sociology of Literature', in *Radical Religion: The Bible and Liberation* (Community for Religious Research and Education, 1976), 84-93; id., *Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978).
  23. Cf. Theissen, 'Soziale Schichtung', 268-72; id., 'Itinerant Radicalism', 91 f.; id., 'Die Starken und die Schwachen in Korinth', *EvTh* 35 (1975), 171 ff. Theissen owes the expression 'love-patriarchalism' to E. Troeltsch, *The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches* i (New York: Harper, 1960), 78: 'This is the type of Christian patriarchalism founded upon the religious recognition of and the religious overcoming of an earthly inequality.'
  24. For the participation of women in cult associations and philosophical schools, cf. L. Swidler, 'Greco-Roman Feminism and the Reception of the Gospel', in B. Jaspert and R. Mohr (eds.), *Traditio-Krisis-Renovatio aus theologischer Sicht* (Marburg: Elwert, 1976), 49-52; W. A. Meeks, 'The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity', *History of Religion* 13 (1974), 169-74.
  25. Cf. E. E. Ellis, 'Paul and his Co-Workers', *NTS* 17 (1970/71), 439; cf. also the essay of M. A. Getty on *synergos* in Swidler and Swidler, *Women Priests*, 176-82.
  26. Cf. W. D. Thomas, 'The Place of Women in the Church at Philippi', *Expository Times* 83 (1972), 117-20; R. W. Graham, 'Women in the Pauline Churches: A Review Article', *Lexington Theological Quarterly* 11 (1976), 29 f.
  27. Cf. F. F. Filson, 'The Significance of the Early House Churches', *JBL* 58 (1939), 105-12; E. A. Judge, *The Social Patterns of Christian Groups in the First Century* (London: Tyndale Press, 1960), 36: 'Not only was the conversion of a household the natural or even necessary way of establishing the cult in unfamiliar surroundings, but the household remained the soundest basis for the meeting of Christians.'
  28. Cf. R. J. M. Kelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), and my article 'Cultic Language in Qumran and in the New Testament', *CBQ* 38 (1976), 159-79.
  29. Cf. however E. Lohse, *Colossians and Philemon* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 190: 'The lady of the house had to deal daily with the slaves. Therefore she had to give her opinion when the question of taking back a runaway slave was raised.' The tendency is clear. Apphia is reduced to a wife and mistress, although like the two men she is given a Christian characterization.
  30. Cf. E. Käsemann, *An die Römer* (HNT 8a; Tübingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973), 394, asserts that we are justified to count the couple among the most outstanding early Christian missionaries in the dispersion.
  31. The writer of Codex D (second century) mentions the name of Prisca in second place in Acts 18:26. Not only does he make Aquila the subject of the sentence in 18:2 by writing 'Aquila with his wife Priscilla' but he also mentions Aquila three times (18:3, 7, 22) without referring to Priscilla.
  32. Therefore A. v. Harnack, 'Probabilia über die Adresse und den Verfasser des Hebräerbriefes', *ZNW* 1 (1900), 16-41, suggests that she authored the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is significant that scholars always assume male authorship, although in most cases we do not know who wrote the NT books.
  33. Cf. my 'The Apostleship of Women', 136 ff.
  34. See Ellis, 'Paul and his Co-Workers', 445-51.
  35. Cf. B. Bauer, 'Uxores Circumducere 1 Kor 9:53', *BZNF* 3 (1959), 94-102. E. Käsemann suggests that the missionary couples follow the synoptic injunction that the apostles should go out 'two by two' (cf. Mk 6:7 par.). Cf. also the interpretation of Clement of Alexandria (Strom 111.6.53, 3f.), 'and took their wives with them not as women with whom they had marriage relations but as sisters, that they might be their fellow-ministers (*syndiakonous*) in dealing with housewives. It was through them that the Lord's teaching penetrated also the women's quarters without any scandal being aroused.' However, the text does not give any indication of encratite behaviour.
  36. *The History of the Early Church* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1963), 146.
  37. Cf. A. Lemaire, 'From Services to Ministries: Diakonia in the First Two Centuries', *Concilium* 14 (1972), 35-49; K. H. Schelkle, 'Ministry and Ministers in the NT Church', *Concilium* 11 (1969), 5-11; A. Lemaire, 'The Ministries in the NT: Recent Research', *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 3 (1973), 133-66.

38. Cf. B. Reicke, 'prohistemē', *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (TDNT), iv. 703: the verb as well as the substantive 'have the twofold sense of leadership and care'.
39. Cf. H. Gamble, *The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans* (Studies and Documents 42; Grand Rapids, Mich.: 1977), 87.
40. H. D. Betz, 'Spirit, Freedom and Law: Paul's Message to the Galatian Churches', *Svensk Exeg. Arsbok* 39 (1974), 145–60; M. Bouttier, 'Complexio Oppositorum: Sur les formules de 1 Cor xii. 13; Gal iii. 26–28; Col iii. 10.11', *NTS* 23 (1976), 1–19; Meeks, 'The Androgyne', 181.
41. Cf. A. Oepke, 'gynē', TDNT, i. 777 n. 4. The prayer therefore expresses a commonly accepted cultural attitude toward women, and should not be used to denounce Judaism since we have rabbinic passages similar to Gal 3:28; cf. J. Leiboldt, *Jesus und die Frauen* (Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1921), 14f. For the critique of anti-Jewish tendencies in feminist theology cf. J. Plaskow, 'Christian Feminism and Anti-Judaism', *Cross Currents* 28/3 (1978).
42. This is maintained by W. Schmitthals, *Die Gnosis in Korinth* (FRLANT 66; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956), 227 n. 1; cf. also Meeks, 'The Androgyne', 180 ff., and R. Scroggs, 'Paul and the Eschatological Woman: Revisited', *JAAR* 42 (1974), 536. However these authors appear to identify gender roles with sexual-biological roles. Betz, 'Spirit, Freedom and Law', correctly stresses that here male and female societal cultural gender roles are abolished in the Christian community.
43. Cf. the Gospel of Thomas, the Gospel of Mary, and Pistis Sophia. See my analysis of gnostic perceptions and attitudes toward women, 'Word, Spirit, and Power: Women in Early Christian Communities', in R. R. Ruether and E. McLaughlin (eds.), *Women of Spirit* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1979).
44. For the definition and distinction of sex and gender cf. A. Oakley, *Sex, Gender and Society* (New York: Harper, 1972), 158 ff.
45. Exegetes often understand the text as applying not to the Church but to the equality of souls, to eschatological equality, or to equality in heaven, or they maintain that the differences are only overcome sacramentally or spiritually *coram deo*. For a criticism of such an interpretation cf. K. Stendahl, *The Bible and the Role of Women* (FB 15; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966), 32 ff.
46. Cf. B. L. Mack, *Logos und Sophia: Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie im Hellenistischen Judentum* (SUNT 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973); R. Marcus, 'On Biblical Hypostases of Wisdom', *HUCA* 23 (1950/51), 157–71.
47. B. A. Pearson, *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in 1 Corinthians* (SBL Diss. 12; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1973), 37.
48. Cf. my 'Wisdom Mythology and the Christological Hymns of the New Testament', in R. Wilken (ed.), *Aspects of Wisdom in Judaism and Early Christianity* (Notre Dame: Indiana University Press, 1976), 17–41 (literature).
49. Cf. my 'Wisdom Mythology', 30 ff.; J. M. Reese, *Hellenistic Influences on the Book of Wisdom and its Consequences* (AB 41; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1970), 33–50.
50. Cf. Pearson, *Pneumatikos-Psychikos*, 82 ff.; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 58 ff.; id., 'Paul und die Weisheit', *NTS* 12 (1965/66), 231–4. Conzelmann, however, maintains that it is Paul and not the Corinthians who profess a Jewish-Hellenistic wisdom theology. Cf. however B. A. Pearson, 'Hellenistic-Jewish Wisdom Speculation and Paul', in Wilken, *Aspects of Wisdom*, 43–66.
51. Cf. Wendland, *Die Briefe and die Korinther* (NTD 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), 80; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 182, points to a certain tension in chs. 11–14, because 11:2–16 already deals with behavior at divine worship, while a new topic is introduced only in 12:1. E. Kähler, *Die Frau in den Paulinischen Briefen* (Zürich: Gotthelf, 1960), 43 f., suggests that 10:32–11:2 are the introduction and headline to 11:3–16.
52. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, suggests that 'this idea is better suited to interpolation than to Paul, and is suggested by it' (246). For the prophetic self-understanding of Paul, cf. however U. B. Müller, *Prophetie und Predigt im Neuen Testament* (StNT 10; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1975), 117–233.
53. On the concept of 'good order' cf. G. Dautzenberg, *Urchristliche Prophetie. Ihre Erforschung, ihre Voraussetzungen im Judentum und ihre Struktur im 1. Korintherbrief* (BWANT 104; Tübingen: Mohr, 1974), 278–84.
54. J. C. Hurd, Jr, *The Origin of 1 Corinthians* (New York: Seabury, 1965), 287: 'We have suggested that much of the "wisdom" and "knowledge" to which they clung had been given them by Paul himself . . . Here we meet a younger, more vigorous Paul, fired with enthusiasm in his new faith, less cautious in his theological statements than he later became, little conscious of the weaknesses of human nature.' Cf. also J. W. Drane, 'Tradition, Law and Ethics in Pauline Theology', *NovT* 16 (1974), 167–87, who points out the shift in Paul's theology in Gal. and 1 Cor.
55. Cf. G. Delling, *Paulus Stellung zu Frau und Ehe* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1931), 96–105. S. Lösch, 'Christliche Frauen in Korinth', *Theologische Quartalschrift* 127 (1947), 216–61; M. D. Hooker, 'Authority on Her Head: An Examination of 1 Cor 11: 10', *NTS* 10 (1963/4), 410–16; A. Joubert, 'Le voile des femmes', *NTS* 18 (1972), 419–30.
56. Cf. Lösch, 'Christliche Frauen', 240 ff.; J. B. Hurley, 'Did Paul Require Veils or the Silence of Women? A Consideration of 1 Cor 11:2–16 and 1 Cor 14:33b–36', *Westminster Theological Journal* 35 (1972/3), 190–220; W. J. Martin, '1 Cor 11:2:16: An Interpretation', in W. W. Gasque and R. R. Martin (eds.), *Apostolic History and the Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970), 231–4; J. Murphy-O'Connor, *L'Existence chrétienne selon saint Paul* (LD 80; Paris: Cerf, 1974), 103–4 n. 37; A. Isaakson, *Marriage and Ministry in the New Temple* (ASNU 24; Lund: Gleerup, 1965), 165–86.
57. Tib. I, 3, 29–32. For other cults cf. Lösch, 'Christliche Frauen'.
58. S. Kelly Heyob, *The Cult of Isis among Women in the Greco-Roman World* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 60.
59. Ibid. 52.
60. Ibid. 105 f.; cf. also R. E. Witt, *Isis in the Graeco-Roman World* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1971).
61. W. C. Van Unnik, 'Les cheveux défaits des femmes baptisées', *VigChr* 1 (1947), 77–100.
62. Cf. H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, iii (Munich: Beck, 1926), 428 f., for the hairstyle of Jewish women.
63. Cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, 'A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of 1 Cor 11:10', *NTS* 4 (1957/8), 48–58.

64. J. B. Schaller, 'Gen 1, 2 im antiken Judentum' (dissertation, Göttingen, 1961), points out that the series God-Adam-Eve is found in the targum translation of Gn 1:26f. and 2:18. Therefore he argues that Paul enlarged this series by introducing Christ (188f.).
65. H. Schlier, 'kephale', *TDNT*, iii. 679.
66. Cf. J. Jervell, *Imago Dei: Gen 1, 26f im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den Paulinischen Briefen* (FRLANT 76; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960), 110, claims that 'the tendency of rabbinic theology is not only to deny image-of-God status to Eve . . . but also to every woman'.
67. *Ibid.* 301; cf. also 109. For the religious duties of women, cf. L. Swidler, *Women in Judaism: The Status of Women in Formative Judaism* (Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1976), 82 ff. The rabbinic evidence can only be used with great caution for the interpretation of Pauline texts, since the rabbinic passages are hard to date.
68. Cf. Gn r. 22(14d) in Strack and Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, iii. 440: man not without woman, woman not without man, neither of them without the Shekinah.
69. Cf. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 190 esp. nn. 96 and 97.
70. Meeks, 'The Androgyne', 200: 'Paul seems primarily concerned to reassert the distinction between male and female and the inferiority of the woman to the man.' Similarly R. Scroggs, who claims that Paul intends to eliminate the inequality between the sexes but not the distinctions.
71. Cf. esp. the works of G. Dautzenberg and U. Müller. W. A. Meeks, "'Since then You Would Need to Go Out of the World": Group Boundaries in Pauline Christianity' in Thomas J. Ryan (ed.), *Critical History and Biblical Faith* (Villanova: Villanova University Press, 1979), characterizes the Pauline church as 'an open sect, concerned not to offend "those outside" but attract them to its message and if possible to its membership'. However, it is questionable whether this describes the attitude of the Pauline church or of Paul himself.
72. Cf. Dautzenberg, 253-88.
73. Cf. esp. Scroggs, 'The Eschatological Woman', 295-7. Cf. also W. Schrage, 'Zur Frontstellung der Paulinischen Ehebewertung in 1 Kor 7:1-7', *ZNW* 67 (1976), 214-34 (literature).
74. K. Niederwimmer, *Askese und Mysterium* (FRLANT 113; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), 80-123.
75. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 134; cf. also S. Schulz, 'Evangelium und Welt. Hauptprobleme einer Ethik des Neuen Testaments', in H. D. Betz and L. Schottroff, *Neues Testament und Christliche Existenz* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1973), 483-501.
76. Cf. Niederwimmer, *Askese und Mysterium*, 115.
77. J. E. Crouch, *The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel* (FRLANT 109; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 138 ff.
78. Cf. my 'Interpreting Patriarchal Traditions', in Russel, *The Liberating Word*, 55-9.
79. For the impact of this development on the contemporary Church, cf. my 'Feminist Theology as a Critical Theology of Liberation', *Theological Studies* 36 (1975), 605-25; and my 'Feminist Spirituality, Christian Identity and Catholic Vision', *NICM Journal* 1 (1976), 20-34.
80. E. Pagels, 'Paul and Women: A Response to a Recent Discussion', *JAAR* 42 (1974), 547.